DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 931 CS 508 410

AUTHOR Brokke, Mervin E., Jr.
TITLE A Comparative Study of Job Burnout in Army Public Affairs Commissioned Officers and Department of the Army Civilians.
PUB DATE Nov 93
NOTE 92p.; M.A. Thesis, Marshall University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Armed Forces; *Burnout; Communication Research; Comparative Analysis; *Job Satisfaction; *Military Personnel; Military Training; National Surveys; Occupational Surveys; Organizational Climate; *Public Relations
IDENTIFIERS Organizational Culture

ABSTRACT

A study examined whether commissioned public affairs officers show more instances of job burnout than Department of the Army civilians serving in the Army public affairs positions. Surveys were sent to all public affairs officers working in offices in the continental United States. Of the 399 survey packets mailed to the 56 public affairs offices, 215 valid surveys from the target population of 332 were completed, for a return rate of 65%. Results indicated that: (1) public affairs officers, on the average, exhibited a moderate level of job burnout; (2) military officers did not exhibit an overwhelming amount of job burnout when compared to civilians; (3) public affairs officers, both military and civilian, exhibited levels of job burnout similar to that of other groups; (4) the group of senior commissioned officers, when compared to younger commissioned officers, reported experiencing a greater percentage of lower-level job burnout; and (5) several respondents stated there was a need for a change in the curriculum of military public affairs training if graduates are to do the job Army leaders require of them. Findings suggest that public affairs officers, both military and civilian, exhibited a moderate level of burnout. (Twenty-two tables of data are included; the instruction letter, the demographic questionnaire, a sample letter of introduction, and responses to the open-ended question are attached. Contains 27 references. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CE

ED 364 931

A Comparative Study of Job Burnout in Army Public Affairs Commissioned Officers and Department of the Army Civilians

A Thesis
Presented to the Faculty of the
W. Page Pitt School of Journalism and Mass Communications
Marshall University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for a
Master of Arts Degree in Journalism

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Brokke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by
Mervin E. Brokke, Jr.
November 1993

AS508410

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This Thesis was accepted as meeting the research requirement for the master's degree.

Harold C. Shaver

11/93

Harold C. Shaver, Ph.D. — Date
Director
W. Page Pitt School of Journalism and Mass Communications
Thesis Advisor

11-17-93

Dr. Ralph J. Turner, Ph.D. — Date
Professor of Journalism
W. Page Pitt School of Journalism and Mass Communications
Thesis Committee Member

11-16-93

Corley F. Dennison III, Ph.D. — Date
Associate Professor of Journalism
W. Page Pitt School of Journalism and Mass Communications
Thesis Committee Member

11/16/93

Leonard J. Deutsch, Ph.D. — Date
Dean of the Graduate School

Table of Contents

List of Tables iv

Chapter 1 1

Introduction 1

Statement of Research Question 1

Background of Problem 1

Significance of Study 11

Problems to be Investigated 13

Hypotheses 13

Assumptions and Limitations 13

Chapter 2 16

Review of the Literature 16

Chapter 3 21

Design of the Investigation 21

Sources of Data 21

Procedures for Collecting Data 21

Instruments 23

Treatment of Data 24

Chapter 4 26

Results of the Data 26

Chapter 5 45

Summary and Interpretation 45

Future Research 55

Appendices 57

Instruction Letter 57

Demographic Questionnaire 59

Sample Letter of Introduction 61

Responses to Open-Ended Question 62

Bibliography 83

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Number of Respondents per Age Group	26
2.	Military and Civilian	27
3.	Years of Government Service	28
4.	Years in Public Affairs per Respondent	28
5.	Number of Respondents: Rank and GS Level	29
6.	Number of Undergraduate Degrees	29
7.	Number of Graduate Degrees	30
8.	Completion of Military Public Affairs Training	31
9.	Reported Job Satisfaction	32
10.	Comparison of the Correlations Between MBI Subscales	33
11.	Planning to Leave Their Jobs	34
12.	Comparison of Correlations	35
13.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for MBI Subscales	36
14.	Levels of Burnout For Each Subscale	36
15.	Emotional Exhaustion	38
16.	Personal Accomplishment	39
17.	Depersonalization	39
18.	Means and Standard Deviations for MBI Subscales	40
19.	Military and Civilian Means and Standard Deviations	42
20.	Emotional Exhaustion and Burnout Level of Military	43

21. Depersonalization and Burnout Level of Military . . 44

22. Personal Accomplishment and Burnout Level of Military 44

Chapter 1

Introduction

The need for research into job burnout among Army public affairs officers was conceived after reviewing the research on the effects of work environment on job burnout in newspaper reporters and copy editors conducted by Cook, Banks, and Turner ("The Effects of Work Environment on Job Burnout in Newspaper Reporters and Copy Editors," 1993) and after many discussions with officers in the U.S. Army. Additionally, the experiences of Army public affairs officers provided real examples of role conflict, ambiguity, training incongruities, and job burnout.

Statement of Research Question

Because of inadequate or incomplete training, less autonomy, added stress of military commitments, and less job satisfaction, do commissioned public affairs officers show more instances of job burnout than Department of the Army civilians serving in Army public affairs positions?

Background of Problem

Army public affairs officers face many job-related problems. They often are seen by superiors and peers to be less than professional officers, and not vital members of the team.

Michael S. Hvezdos, in a 1988 study of the perceptions

of the Army public affairs function among commanding generals and Army public affairs officers, found that a public affairs officer's "interface with the [commander's] staff and subordinate commanders reflects less confidence [in] the public affairs officer as a full team member than is the perception of the commanding general" (95).

In other words, Hvezdos found that in determining the overall level of confidence in the public affairs officer, more influential than the commander's perceptions of his public affairs officer were the perceptions and actions of the commander's staff officers. A key indicator of this lack of confidence was the exclusion of the public affairs officers from team events, meetings, and training exercises. [Lack of] attendance at appropriate staff meetings and briefings indicates that the public affairs officer is not always brought in as a team member (95).

In addition, Gerald W. Sharpe asserts that the Army needs to treat media relations as an important part of the Army mission (from PA Index: 5). Too often, media and the public affairs officer are seen as an afterthought during mission planning and execution.

Because public affairs officers are relegated to so-called second class status, many senior officers look down upon Army public affairs assignments and advise young officers to request other functional areas, to refuse assignments, and to get out of Army Public Affairs and back

to the real Army quickly (Brokke 1).

Army public affairs officers have little or no experience and education in their field when compared with other staff officers. From the first day of commissioning, officers train with little or no thought to obtaining a functional area assignment, such as public affairs. Most officers on brigade, division or corp staffs fill positions that are comparable to those for which they have been training since receiving their commission. For example, a field artillery officer can easily become a fire support officer on a division or higher-level staff as a result of the years of training.

When assigned to an Army public affairs position, most officers receive only the nine-week basic training in the Public Affairs Officer Course outlined later. Obviously, this training is not comparable to the years of training other officers receive to perform critical functions on a commander's staff.

This lack of training for Army public affairs officers leads to difficult and awkward relationships with non-public affairs personnel.

Military personnel, for various reasons, have a variety of feelings toward the news media. In his 1986 study of the origins and development of the Army/Media conflict, Gerald W. Sharpe's survey of senior officers attending the U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, showed these

officers hold a number of negative views about the media (from PA Index 1986: 5).

Cecil Ross' 1986 study, "Media Doctrine: The Missing Element," concluded the Army needs to educate its public affairs officers and senior officers to improve the relationship between the military and the media (13). These poor military-media relations are based on personal ". . . experiences of the past [that] have blinded many in uniform to the positive aspects of media influence" (10). Senior ranking officers reported ". . . they had ample examples of the military being burned" (10).

In 1986, Frank Libutti conducted a military-media panel at the National War College in Washington, D.C. His study, "The Military and the Media: A Time for Education," discusses the roles of the media and the major problems between the military and the media. The report also examined military-media education for U.S. officers at formal schools (from PA Index 1986: 4).

Libutti identified four problem areas where differences of opinion, ethics, and experience strain or make difficult the military-media relationship: (1) credibility; (2) old corps attitudes; (3) two different cultures; and (4) lack of military experience (Libutti 8).

The key aspect of the military-media relationship is the image of some public affairs officers who perform their missions more as a function of public relations than as a

journalist or spokesperson/media escort. "There are public affairs officers who attempt to manipulate the media by acting like 'PR' men showing only the good news story and not telling the full story" (9). The journalist senses a lack of credibility and often will pursue the story to discover the "real" truth or the entire story.

The memories of the media in Vietnam and other more recent military actions, are long lasting. Many senior officers who participated in Libutti's study, possessed negative "Old Corps Attitudes" of the media. These attitudes manifested themselves and were passed to others when senior officers mentored the younger officers; a senior officer would drive ". . . his message home by admonishing his young officers to beware of press/tv personages, for they are a dishonest crew, a ruthless bunch, a band who'd sell their mothers for a story" (9).

Libutti stated that military and media personnel come from two different cultures and the differences place the two groups at odds with one another.

> The military culture, with its accents [sic] on conformity, control, discipline, accountability, group loyalty, and cohesion, finds itself in wartime up against a group that is individualistic, competitive, world-conscious, impatient, lacking internal "rules" or "standards," varied in its needs, suspicious of authority, and hard pressed by deadlines and the need to obtain good film or definitive information on short notice to satisfy the home office (14).

Another problem area in the military-media relationship arises when journalists covering military actions lack

military experience. The problem is centered on misconceptions and misunderstandings because these journalists do not fully understand their subjects. "If they don't [have military experience], journalists will view 'soldiers' as puppets who react to the manipulation of the leaders, and will look upon leaders as power hungry ideologs with great egos" (14).

During a phone conversation with a senior Pentagon official, Libutti learned that many other senior Pentagon officials have cited the lack of military experience among Pentagon journalists as a major cause of the conflict between the military and the media (5).

Finally, Libutti found that Army public affairs officers, by virtue of their mission, are in the middle of and act as liaisons between two groups who see each other, real or imaginary, at cross-purposes with one another. For example,

> The major complaint raised by the military, regarding the role of the media, focuses on SECURITY ... security regarding life threatening situations and security as it concerns our national interests (4).

On the other hand, the press serves a major function for the government and the public. The government has the obligation to inform the people of its activities (24). The press is one conduit for this information. Army public affairs officers serve to bring together these adversaries with the result of often misplaced animosity toward the

messenger and liaison.

Army public affairs officers, who experience tremendous pressure in their assignments, invariably show signs of role conflict, role ambiguity, and job burnout. This pressure stems from the expectation that public affairs officers will produce although they are not given full or complete training and are not invited to participate in the team's functions. Their association with the civilian media also works against them.

Army leaders recognize some, if not all, of these shortcomings and provide public affairs officers classroom and "hands-on" training at military and civilian institutions. However, not everyone can take advantage of all training offered. While there are several opportunities for extended schooling, most Army public affairs training courses offer intensive, although general, instruction for periods of nine or ten weeks.

The basic nine-week **Public Affairs Officer Course** covers basic public affairs practices and communication methods, principles of speech, research, and print and broadcast journalism techniques. It also treats theory, concepts, policies and principles of community relations within the military environment. The course also familiarizes students with foreign area studies and public affairs practices unique to each service (Professional Development Guidebook 21).

The Senior Public Affairs Officer Course is an ongoing professional development workshop, and experienced personnel can attend more than once. The course is one week of graduate-level instruction designed to prepare students to understand and respond to major current issues (22).

The Air Force Short Course in Communications is conducted at the University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. Over the seven-week period, the course provides postgraduate-level university education in state-of-the-art communication theory, research, strategies and tactics.

It also includes scholarly study of human behavior, human interpersonal and organizational communication; types of research; research theory; directions, perspectives, methodology, evaluation, and application; nature and use of public opinion; development of effective communication strategies through image formulation and change; communication role of print, electronic, and film media; and legal, political, sociocultural, economic, and educational aspects of media employment (27-28).

Training with Industry affords selected officers the opportunity to intern with a civilian business enterprise for training not available through the military service school systems nor through civilian colleges or school systems. Length of this assignment is 10 months (24).

The **Army Advanced Public Affairs Course** is a 10-week course for majors and above. Intended to enhance

professional experience and training by blending instructional elements in mass communications research and theory with training in practical skills, the course is geared toward management of Army public affairs with emphasis on research methodology, data evaluation, strategic planning for public affairs policy, and communication theory.

Students examine issues in crisis management, communications law, public opinion and propaganda, and media services management. Students also survey visual communication techniques and receive advanced training in feature writing and editing for print, speech writing, management of promotions and functions, and preparation for press conferences (27).

The **Cooperative Degree Program** offers an alternative to the fully funded graduate program for officers who desire to obtain an advanced degree in a public affairs field. The training takes place at the University of Kansas, Lawrence campus, and lasts for 12 months of full-time enrollment after successful completion of a Command and General Staff College. Enrollment in the program requires cooperation and coordination among three agencies: the officers' branch at PERSCOM (Personnel Command), the Office of Graduate Studies at the Command and General Staff College Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and the University of Kansas (50).

The **Degree on the Installment Plan** offers an officer

the opportunity to earn a graduate degree from the University of South Carolina in either a thesis or non-thesis program. Graduate students must take 30-33 hours of approved courses, depending on the program. Of these, 21 hours must be taken in residence at the university (54).

The **Fully-Funded Graduate Degree Program** affords an officer the opportunity to earn a master's degree at Marshall University in Huntington, West Virginia. The Army has established a standard program of instruction at Marshall University to which Army students are regularly sent for graduate studies in journalism and public relations. Currently, the program requires Army students to meet the standards for both thesis and non-thesis programs (38).

Through these seven programs Army public affairs officers are provided opportunities to attend school and receive the necessary education to succeed in the field. However, many officers are only able or allowed to attend the basic Public Affairs Officer Course and do not continue formal public affairs education. Even with the educational opportunities, misperceptions about public affairs and civilian media run deep among officers.

As seen in several studies of senior military officers, the beliefs and attitudes of these officers, who are not assigned to Army Public Affairs and often superior in rank and position to the public affairs officer, reflect

negatively both on the media and the public affairs officer. In Sharpe's study, noted above, this conflict between the Army and the media has existed "from the earliest days of the development of the newspaper" (qtd. from PA Index: 5).

Public affairs officers become prime candidates for job burnout because of the history of conflict with the media, the stigma of being a second-class officer, the lack of peer cohesion, and limited education and training.

Significance of Study

It is important to study this problem to learn if job burnout exists and if there is a significant difference between military personnel and civilians working in Army public affairs.

The results could show additional training, stabilization, or possibly the forming of a public affairs branch is necessary to conduct the Army's public affairs mission and prevent premature burnout.

Relatively little has been written about job burnout in the Army and Army public affairs. Much has been written about stress and battle fatigue. The Army spends a great deal of time and effort in preventing and reducing stress through physical and mental training. Instructors and commanders prepare soldiers for battle by honing skills and developing support systems within the unit for the soldier and outside the unit for family members.

The answers to the research question could give

direction to changing the Army's thinking about public affairs officers and their mission. This new information could give impetus to the Army's continuing development of new public affairs officers so they are competitive with their civilian counterparts.

Army public affairs officers, like Army personnel in general, have a high turnover rate. Typically, an officer will move from one installation to the next after three to four years. Some tours of duty are referred to as short-tours. A short-tour can last from one to two years.

Additionally, officers do not usually remain in one position for more than one to two years. Advancement is the key. For instance, an officer will accept an assignment as a unit commander and remain in that unit for at least a year but never more than two. Remaining in a position for more than two years is an exception and not the norm.

So, for the Army public affairs officer, stability in the job is not a given. Most likely, an officer begins to suffer from job burnout and moves on to the next scheduled assignment before it affects job performance. However, leaders must detect the first signs of job burnout and intervene immediately.

"Thus, the purpose of measuring job burnout is to develop some type of profile of who is 'at risk' for leaving the job. In professions with high job turnover it may be especially critical to develop such profiles and to develop

intervention procedures to avoid such high levels of job turnover" (Cook and Banks 2).

Problems to be Investigated

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed based upon experience, and review of the literature.

H1. Commissioned officers and Department of the Army civilians, serving in Army public affairs positions, will exhibit some level of job burnout as defined by the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

H2. Commissioned officers serving in Army public affairs positions will exhibit more job burnout than Department of the Army civilians.

H3. Army public affairs officers, both military and civilian, will exhibit job burnout similar to that of human service employees, and educators.

H4. Commissioned officers with more time in service and more training, who are serving in Army public affairs positions, will exhibit less job burnout than officers with less training and fewer years in service.

Assumptions and Limitations

The target population for this research was all public affairs officers, working in offices in the continental United States, listed in the Worldwide Public Affairs Directory, and containing both civilian and military personnel, in the proper ranks and grades. It must be

assumed that the results of this project can be generalized to the entire population of Army and civilian public affairs officers worldwide.

Because this was an in-house survey, it was assumed that Army public affairs officers and civilians would be willing to participate.

One limitation was that not every public affairs officer, military and civilian, had an opportunity to participate in this survey because many public affairs offices did not have a mix of military and civilian personnel.

Surveys were mailed to the senior Army public affairs officer in charge of each office. They were asked to distribute the survey packets to the proper individuals. Distribution of the surveys was voluntary and assuming that the surveys were distributed, there is no certainty that they were distributed to the proper individuals in all cases.

Conducting the survey during the summer, historically a period of great turnover for military personnel, may find new personnel filling Army public affairs officer positions. These new personnel may not have been in the job long enough to be subject to job burnout.

Senior officers may be unwilling to jeopardize their careers by answering questions about how they feel about their jobs and the personnel with whom they work. Also,

these officers and other participants may be unwilling to admit having feelings of depression. The promise of anonymity and the individual return envelopes may relieve some of this anxiety.

The Human Services Survey uses the word "recipients," "to refer to the people for whom you provide your service, care, treatment, or instruction (Human Services Survey). Recepients defined as such does not apply to the target audience.

Dr. Christina Maslach (Brokke 2), who developed the Maslach Burnout Inventory, agreed that the term "recipients" could be redefined, for the purposes of this survey, to mean "the people with whom you come into contact inside and outside of the office daily." Due to time constraints, instructions about this change were added to the individual cover letters instead of requesting a change to the MBI instrument through the Consulting Psychologists Press.

For future research, the term recipient should be deleted from the MBI and replaced with a more specific term related to Army public affairs personnel.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Stress and the related health hazards and syndromes are a recent discovery. Social scientists and physicians are continuing to link stress with specific job-related health disorders.

Stress affects everyone at work and in everyday life. Some persons are more effective when they are under a certain level of stress, but there are limits to the amount of stress under which one can perform effectively. One form of stress is burnout, which happens when aspirations and expectations are thwarted and one becomes depressed and used up (Bellot abstract).

"The phenomenon [of job burnout] was first formally differentiated by Herbert Freudenberger, and Christina Maslach is the field's best-known methodologist" (Paine 12-13). In the second edition of the Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual, Christina Maslach and Susan E. Jackson define and describe the syndrome of job burnout as being, in part, a combination of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment.

> A key aspect of the burnout syndrome is increased feelings of emotional exhaustion; as emotional resources are depleted, workers feel they are no longer able to give of themselves at a psychological level. Another aspect of the burnout syndrome is the development of

> depersonalization i.e., negative, cynical attitudes and feelings about one's clients. A third aspect of the burnout syndrome, reduced personal accomplishments, refers to the tendency to evaluate oneself negatively, particularly with regard to one's work with clients (1).

"Herzberg's Motivation Hygiene Theory claimed that both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction levels were crucial in the evaluations of overall job satisfaction" (Cook and Banks 3). Factors contributing to satisfaction include little or no role conflict and/or ambiguity, a sense of involvement in work, peer cohesion, supervisor support, personal autonomy, the degree of task orientation, and a sense of physical comfort (Cook, Banks, and Turner 4).

In his 1986 study, "Overall Stress and Job Satisfaction as Predictors of Burnout," David Friesen studied occupational burnout in two samples: 1,191 public school teachers and 190 principals and vice principals. Overall job stress, job satisfaction, job challenge, and role clarity were examined for their ability to predict burnout (Friesen abstract).

Factor analysis confirmed the three dimensions of burnout found by Maslach: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion burnout was best predicted by overall job stress, followed by the degree of satisfaction with status and recognition, the degree of satisfaction with work load, and job challenge. Depersonalization burnout and lack of personal accomplishment burnout were predicted by the degree

of satisfaction with status and job challenge (Friesen abstract).

Job burnout is affecting more and more of the working population. The problem of burnout is more widespread than originally thought (Mclean and Clouse abstract).

Burnout has a great deal to do with societal issues and the way that society defines the self concept of individuals. When people do not feel as societal values dictate, they often begin to sense disappointment in themselves, their life styles, and what they are receiving from people around them in the form of approval, praise, or friendship (Margolin abstract). Men and women place almost their entire self-worth in their jobs and job outcomes (Margolin abstract).

In Philip E. Soucy's 1978 field study of role conflict in the professional lives of Army public affairs officers, results show the conflict in Army public affairs officers' professional lives is a result of interaction between expectations and legitimacy. Role conflict was not influenced by rank, career specialty, or source of public affairs officer training (Soucy abstract). In other words, the public affairs officers in this study suffered from role conflict due to how they perceived their supervisors/leaders evaluated their performance and not how the public affairs officers viewed themselves and their own performance.

In his 1988 study of the perceptions of the Army public

affairs function among commanding generals and Army public affairs officers, Michael S. Hvezdos confirmed his first hypothesis: Public affairs officers were not perceived by the sample of commanding generals to be effective managers (95).

In the same study, Hvezdos made several key conclusions that relate directly to the onset of job burnout: Public affairs officers need to be better trained as managers; resources and responsibilities in the Army public affairs program need to be solidified; greater emphasis must be given to reward the "good" public affairs officer through promotions, selections for school and other rewards; and grade authorizations require review (104). Public affairs officers must be seen as vital parts of the team and treated as such.

The written responses from the participants in Hvezdos' study reflect the negative opinions commanders hold toward the Army public affairs officers in their units. Many commanders viewed their Army public affairs officers as poorly trained, inexperienced, and merely filling slots. Other comments were directly related to how negatively officers felt about Army public affairs in general (72).

In his 1987 study, "The Role of Public Affairs in Low Intensity Conflict," James M. Kelly concluded, "Public Affairs is not yet fully integrated into operational planning as illustrated by the fact that public affairs

personnel seldom participate as players in exercise scenarios" (qtd. from PA Index 1987: 4). This lack of involvement in major unit operations, lack of peer cohesion, and not being seen as a team member reflect directly on a public affairs officer's sense of personal accomplishment, a key factor in job burnout.

Kelly's study showed that Army public affairs officers are prime candidates for job burnout. Among peers, the Army public affairs officer is often seen as unnecessary and not a part of the command team.

Army public affairs officers are at an extreme disadvantage when compared to their peers on brigade, division, corps and higher-level staffs in terms of education and training. Whereas most, if not all, staff members have trained their entire careers to fill their present staff positions, Army public affairs officers most likely have had approximately nine weeks of formal training, on-the-job training and possibly undergraduate training in journalism or journalism-related field (Brokke 3).

Chapter 3

Design of the Investigation

Sources of Data

The target population for this study is commissioned officers and Department of the Army civilians who work in Army public affairs offices in supervisor or leadership positions in the continental United States.

The survey instruments (Maslach Burnout Inventory, and demographic questionnaire) were mailed to senior Army public affairs officers in active duty military units and commands. The surveys were administered to personnel in Army public affairs offices with both civilian and military personnel working together under the same or similar commanders and conditions.

The target population, according to the Worldwide Public Affairs Guide, was 332 commissioned officers and civilians. To obtain data from any personnel not accounted for in the directory, working in a particular office, and who satisfied all target population requirements, an aggregate total of 399 survey packets were mailed to the 56 offices.

Procedures for Collecting Data

In order to get a better understanding of job burnout and the Maslach Burnout Inventory, an MBI sampler set was

purchased from the Consulting Psychologists Press. The sampler set consisted of two sample MBIs (Educators and Human Services Surveys), two sample demographic surveys, a scoring key, and the Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual Second Edition.

The demographic questionnaire was modified to target the military and civilian members of the target population.

Four hundred copies of the Maslach Burnout Inventory--Human Services Survey--were purchased from the Consulting Psychologists Press in Palo Alto, California.

Large envelopes with clasps and gummed flaps were purchased for the return mailing. Envelopes were self-addressed and stamped.

In July 1993, 56 packages, containing the survey packets, were mailed to the senior Army public affairs officer at the public affairs offices identified for this survey. Each package contained a specific number of survey packets and a letter of introduction. The letter of instruction requested that the senior Army public affairs officers complete a survey and distribute the other surveys to the commissioned officers and Department of the Army civilians within their offices and otherwise under their supervision.

Each survey packet, containing a Human Services survey, a demographic questionnaire, and instructions, was placed inside a pre-addressed stamped envelope to afford anonymity

and easy return.

The respondents were requested to complete the instruments as soon as possible. However, no completion or return date was mandated to them except for the proposed project completion date of 20 August 1993.

After the surveys were completed and returned, they were numbered in order of receipt without reference to return addresses.

A second mailing was conducted 7 August 1993. Post cards were mailed to the 56 senior Army public affairs officers thanking them for their cooperation and requesting that they remind their personnel to return the surveys completed or not.

Instruments

In developing and conceptualizing this project, the Maslach Burnout Inventory was selected because it has proven to be versatile, valid, and reliable. Christina Maslach, a pioneering methodologist in the area, developed the most widely used scale and published the first major research study (Paine, 15). The most commonly used index, of a number of measures that focus more directly on the feeling/emotion area, [is] the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Hurrell 55).

> The MBI is designed to assess the three aspects of the burnout syndrome: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of personal accomplishment. Each aspect is measured by a separate subscale.
>
> Burnout is conceptualized as a continuous variable, ranging from low to moderate to high

> degrees of experienced feeling. It is *not* viewed as a dichotomous variable, which is either present or absent (Maslach and Jackson 2).

The demographic questionnaire used in conjunction with the MBI for this survey was modified to better fit the target population. Using examples from questionnaires used in surveys of human services personnel and newspaper journalists, this instrument was geared to garner specific information related only to the target population. Another very important factor was the time required to complete both instruments. In the interest of making short the respondents' total time with the instruments, certain questions from the two samples questionnaires, such as number of children and religious preference, were considered not appropriate for this study.

Several questions, specific to the military population, were added to gather information about rank, years in government service, military public affairs training, total hours worked during a week, and total number of personnel supervised. These questions added to the other questions combined to make a well-rounded questionnaire that targeted the population and satisfied the study's requirements.

Treatment of Data

After compiling and inputting the data into the Marshall University VAX computer system, the scores for each respondent's burnout subscales were calculated using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). The scores for each

subscale were considered separately and were *not* combined into a single, total score. Thus, three scores were computed for each respondent (2). With this information, the MBI scores were then correlated with demographic information (Maslach and Jackson 5).

Data were also compiled for groups such as military and civilian, and treated as aggregate data. Means and standard deviations for each subscale were computed for the entire group and compared to the normative data (Table 18) for other groups (2).

Chapter 4

Results of the Data

In total, 227 surveys were returned, 12 of which were invalid because the respondents were not commissioned officers. The overall return rate was 68 percent. The data used comes from 215 valid surveys from a target population of 332. The adjusted return rate was 65 percent.

A demographic breakdown of the target population is as follows:

Age by group. There was one person in the 18-25 age group. Forty people reported they were in the 26-33 age group. Sixty-one reported they were in 34-41 age group. The largest group of respondents, 111, were in the 42 and above age group. Two respondents did not report their ages (Table 1).

Table 1
Number of Respondents per Age Group
(Two respondents did not report their age.)

Age Groups	Respondents
18-25	1
26-33	40
34-41	61
42 and above	111

Gender. More men, 129, than women, 86, completed surveys.

Military and civilian. More civilians, 136, responded to the survey than military, 79 (Table 2).

Table 2
Number of Respondents: Military and Civilian

Group	Respondents
Military	79
Civilian	136

Years of government service. There were 16 people with 5 or fewer years (Table 3). Thirty-nine people reported they had been in government service for 6 to 10 years. In the 11 to 15 year group, there were 49 respondents. Fifty-three people reported they had been in employed with the government between 16 to 20 years. The largest group of respondents, 56, have served in the government for 21 or more years. Two respondents did not report their years in government service.

Years in public affairs. The largest group of respondents, 79, have served in the public affairs for 5 or fewer years (Table 4). Sixty-one people reported they had been in public affairs for 6 to 10 years. In the 11 to 15 year group, there were 36 respondents. The smallest group,

15, reported they had been in employed in public affairs from 16 to 20 years. Finally, 23 people reported they had served in public affairs for 21 or more years. One respondent did not report years in public affairs.

Table 3
Years of Government Service per Respondent
(Two respondents did not report their years in service.)

Years of Government Service	Respondent
5 or fewer	16
6-10	39
11-15	49
16-20	53
21 or more	56

Table 4
Years in Public Affairs per Respondent
(One respondent did not report years in public affairs.)

Years in Public Affairs	Respondents
5 or fewer	79
6-10	61
11-15	36
16-20	15
21 or more	23

Rank or GS level. The target population (Table 5) was

composed of 23 commissioned officers between the ranks of 2LT and CPT (pay grades O1-O3), 55 commissioned officers between the ranks of MAJ and COL (pay grades O4-O6), 52 civilians in the pay grades GS5 to GS9, and 85 civilians in the pay grades GS10 and above.

Table 5
Number of Respondents: Rank and GS Level

Rank or GS Level	Respondents
O1-O3 (2LT-CPT)	23
O4-O6 (MAJ-COL)	55
GS5-GS9	52
GS10 and above	85

Table 6
Number of Undergraduate Degrees by Respondent and Type of Degree

Type of Degree	Respondents
Journalism or Communications	70
Other	117
None	28

Undergraduate degree. Of the 215 respondents, 70 had earned degrees in either journalism or a communications related field of study (Table 6). One hundred seventeen persons earned their degrees in fields other than journalism

and communications. Twenty-eight of the respondents reported they did not have an undergraduate degree.

Graduate degree. Of the 215 respondents, 29 had earned graduate degrees in either journalism or a communications related field of study. Fifty-nine individuals earned their graduate degrees in fields other than journalism and communications. The other 127 respondents reported they did not have a graduate degree (Table 7).

Table 7
Number of Graduate Degrees by Respondent and Type of Degree

Type of Degree	Respondents
Journalism or Communications	29
Other	59
None	127

Completion of military public affairs training. More respondents, 70 military, and 82 civilians, reported completion of the Public Affairs Officer Course than any other military public affairs training listed on the questionnaire (Table 8).

Completion of the Senior Public Affairs Officer Course was reported by eight military, and 35 civilians.

Nine members of the military and eight civilians reported they had taken part in the Training with Industry program.

More civilians, 23, than military, 10, said they had completed the Army Advanced Public Affairs Course.

Table 8
Number of Respondents Who Reported Completion of Military Public Affairs Training and Type of Training Completed

Type of Training	Military	Civilian
Public Affairs Officer Course	70	82
Senior Public Affairs Officer Course	8	35
Training With Industry	9	8
Army Advanced Public Affairs Course	10	23
The Cooperative Degree Program	2	0
Fully Funded Graduate Degree Program	15	3

Only two members of the military reported they had taken part in The Cooperative Degree Program. None of the civilian respondents took part in the program.

More military personnel, 15, attended graduate school under The Fully-Funded Graduate Degree program. Only three civilians reported they had been through the program.

Job Satisfaction and Planning to Leave the Job. The majority of public affairs officers reported satisfaction with their jobs (Table 9). Of the civilians, 79% reported

agreement or strong agreement. The military public affairs officers reported 74% agreement or strong agreement. On the other hand, 14% of the military population reported little or no job satisfaction as compared to 12% of the civilian population.

Table 9
Reported Job Satisfaction, Based on Five-Point Likert Scale, of Military and Civilian Army Public Affairs Officers (Percentage and Total)

Groups	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly Agree
Mil.	3%(2)	11%(9)	11%(9)	39%(31)	35%(28)
Civil.	5%(7)	7%(10)	8%(11)	52%(71)	27%(37)

There are strong positive and negative correlations between job satisfaction and the subscales personal accomplishment, 0.44, and emotional exhaustion -0.44 (Table 10).

For comparative purposes, normative data, compiled from many research projects conducted by numerous researchers, was compiled into tabular format in the Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual, Second Edition (iii). The occupations represented in the normative data include:

> 4,163 teachers (elementary and secondary grades K-12); 635 post-secondary educators (college, professional schools); 1,538 social service workers (social workers, child protective service workers); 1104 medical workers (physicians, nurses); 730 mental health workers (psychologists

psychotherapists, counselors, mental hospital staff, psychiatrists); and 2,897 others (legal aid employees, attorneys, police officers, probation officers, ministers, librarians, and agency administrators)(3).

Using this normative data, 0.17 and -0.23 (Table 10) for personal accomplishment and emotional exhaustion respectively, and comparing it with MBI subscale correlations for Army public affairs officers, showed much stronger correlations for the Army public affairs officers.

Table 10
Comparison of the Correlations Between MBI Subscales (Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment) and Reported Job Satisfaction Current and Normative Data (13)

Current Research			
	EE	DP	PA
Job Satisfaction	-0.44	-0.27	0.44
Normative Data (31)			
	EE	DP	PA
Job Satisfaction	-0.23	-0.22	0.17

The negative correlation between depersonalization and job satisfaction, -0.27, is somewhat stronger for the public affairs officers when compared to the normative data, -0.22 (Table 10).

A total of 103 public affairs officers, 48%, reported they were planning to leave their present jobs within the

next five years: 17, (2LT - CPT); 38, (MAJ - COL); 17, (GS5 - GS9); and 31, (GS10 and above) (Table 11).

Table 11
Percentage of and Actual Numbers of Respondents, Military and Civilian, Who Reported Planning to Leave Their Jobs in the Next Five Years

Personnel	Planning to Leave	
	Yes	No
Military	67% (55)	33% (24)
Civilian	35% (48)	65% (89)

The personnel planning to leave reported they were leaving to the following general fields and areas: 28 into public affairs, and 56 into non-public affairs. Of the 55 military personnel planning to leave their present jobs in five years, only 19, 34%, will remain in the Army.

There is a strong correlation between emotional exhaustion and depersonalization for both the public affairs officers, .53, and the normative data, .52 (Maslach 31). The moderate negative correlation between the public affairs officers' personal accomplishment and emotional exhaustion is again fairly similar to the normative data, -.20 and -.22 respectively (Table 12).

However, the moderate negative correlation between personal accomplishment and depersonalization for the public affairs officers, -.19, is not as strong as that of the normative data, -.26 (Table 12).

Table 12
Comparison of Correlations Between Reported Scores on MBI Subscales Scores (Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment) From Current and Normative Data (31)

Current Research		
	Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonalization
Depersonalization	.53	
Personal Accomplishment	-.20	-.19
Normative Data (31)		
	Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonalization
Depersonalization	.52	
Personal Accomplishment	-.22	-.26

Hypotheses

H1. *Commissioned officers and Department of the Army civilians, serving in Army public affairs positions, will exhibit some level of job burnout as defined by the Maslach Burnout Inventory.*

Total and mean scores for each subscale of burnout were calculated for the target population as a whole (Table 13). The population's mean scores for each subscale were then compared to categorization scores for each subscale as listed on the MBI Scoring Key. These were used to determine the exhibited level of burnout for the target population as a whole.

Table 13
Target Population Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for MBI Subscales (Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment)

Subscales	Means	SDs
Emotional Exhaustion	19	10.38
Depersonalization	6	5.22
Personal Accomplishment	38	7.29

Table 14
Levels of Burnout For Each Subscale (Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment) and Range of Scores Utilized for Determining Burnout Levels (MBI Scoring Key)

Burnout level	Range
Emotional Exhaustion	
High	27 or over
Moderate	17 - 26
Low	0 - 16
Depersonalization	
High	27 or over
Moderate	7 - 12
Low	0 - 6
Personal Accomplishment	
High	0 - 31
Moderate	31 - 38
Low	39 or over

The public affairs officers' mean scores for each subscale were: emotional exhaustion, 19; depersonalization

6; and personal accomplishment, 38 (Table 13). After using the subscale ranges in Table 14 as a guide, it was determined that public affairs officers exhibited moderate emotional exhaustion, low depersonalization, and moderate personal accomplishment.

H2. *Commissioned officers serving in Army public affairs positions will exhibit more job burnout than Department of the Army civilians.*

Only 14% of the commissioned officer respondents scored high in emotional exhaustion compared to 21% of the civilians (Table 15). However, 15% of the commissioned officers surveyed reported high depersonalization, as opposed to only 9% of the civilians (Table 17).

Of the commissioned officers surveyed, 18% recorded high burnout levels in the personal accomplishment subscale followed closely by 17% of the civilians (Table 16). Low scores in personal accomplishment equate to a high level of burnout.

Scores for both groups were similar in the low levels of each subscale. The greatest difference between the groups in the low levels of each subscale occurred in depersonalization (Table 17). Commissioned officers recorded 63% as opposed to 60% for civilians at this level.

Finally, at the moderate level of emotional exhaustion, commissioned officers reported a greater percentage than did the civilians (Table 15). The opposite was the case at the

moderate level of depersonalization (Table 16).

H3. *Army public affairs officers as a group, both military and civilian, exhibit job burnout similar to that of human service employees, and educators.*

As stated earlier, the target population's mean scores for each subscale were: emotional exhaustion, 19; depersonalization 6; and personal accomplishment, 38 (Table 13). These subscale scores equate to moderate emotional exhaustion, low depersonalization, and moderate personal accomplishment; overall moderate burnout for the target population.

Table 15
Emotional Exhaustion
Military and Civilian:
(Percentage and Total)
Burnout Level

	Military	Civilian
Low	47% (37)	46% (63)
Moderate	39% (31)	33% (45)
High	14% (11)	21% (28)

Means and Standard Deviations for MBI Subscales (Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment) from the Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual, Second Edition (9), Table 18, were used to compare the mean subscale scores for public affairs officers. In a comparison of sample means: Overall sample (Table 18) and public

affairs officers, the latter group, public affairs officers, scored lower in both emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, and higher in personal accomplishment.

Table 16
Personal Accomplishment
Military and Civilian:
(Percentage and Total)
Burnout Level

	Military	Civilian
Low	54% (43)	54% (73)
Moderate	28% (22)	29% (39)
High	18% (14)	17% (24)

Table 17
Depersonalization
Military and Civilian:
(Percentage and Total)
Burnout Level

	Military	Civilian
Low	63% (50)	60% (81)
Moderate	22% (17)	31% (42)
High	15% (12)	9% (13)

Table 18
Means and Standard Deviations for MBI Subscales (Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment)(9) of Public Affairs Offciers and Other Groups

	Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonali-zation	Personal Accomplishment
Overall Sample (n = 11,067)			
M	20.99	8.73	34.58
SD	10.75	5.89	7.11
Occupational Subgroups			
Public Affairs Officers (Military and Civilian	19 10.38	6 5.22	38 7.29
Teaching (n = 4,163)			
M	21.25	11.00	33.54
SD	11.01	6.19	6.89
Other Education (n = 635)			
M	18.57	5.57	39.17
SD	11.95	6.63	7.92
Social Services (n = 1,538)			
M	21.35	7.46	32.75
SD	10.51	5.11	7.71
Medicine (n = 1,104)			
M	22.19	7.12	36.53
SD	9.53	5.22	7.34
Mental Health (n = 730)			
M	16.89	5.72	30.87
SD	8.90	4.62	6.37
Other (n = 2,897)			
M	21.42	8.11	36.43
SD	11.05	6.15	7.00

When compared to the emotional exhaustion means and standard deviations of other groups listed in Table 18, public affairs officers rate below every group except Mental Health. The mean of 19 and standard deviation of 10.38 for public affairs officers are comparable to the Other Education group's data: M = 18.57 and SD = 11.95. All other groups report higher levels of emotional exhaustion than the public affairs officers.

With a mean score of 6 and a standard deviation of 5.22 in the depersonalization subscale, equating to borderline low level of depersonalization, public affairs officers' scores are comparable to those of Other Education and Mental Health. All other groups reported higher levels of depersonalization compared to that of the public affairs officers.

Of the six comparison groups in Table 18, three report higher levels of personal accomplishment and three report lower levels of personal accomplishment when compared to the public affairs officers' mean of 38 and standard deviation of 7.29. Other Education scored approximately one point higher with a mean score of 39.17 and standard deviation of 7.92. On the other end of the scale with a mean score of 30.17 and standard deviation of 6.37 is the Mental Health group.

When compared to groups in Table 18 as separate groups, commissioned officers and civilians (Table 19) scored higher

than or similar to every group, in every subscale, except 4. The teachers scored higher in depersonalization with 11.00 compared to 9.31 for the military and 9.60 for the civilians. The medicine, other education, and other groups scored higher in personal accomplishment (moderate and low level of burnout) 36.53 and 39.17 respectively compared to 34.42 for the military and 34.63 for the civilians.

Table 19
Military and Civilian Means and Standard Deviations for Burnout Subscales (Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment):

		Military	Civilian
EE	M	22.38	22.57
	SD	11.31	10.17
DP	M	9.31	9.60
	SD	5.52	5.82
PA	M	34.42	34.63
	SD	7.21	6.96

H4. *Commissioned officers with more time in service and more training, who are serving in Army public affairs positions, will exhibit less job burnout than officers with less training and fewer years in service.*

Of the senior commissioned officers, group 2 (MAJ-COL), 56% reported a low burnout level, compared to 21.7 % of the younger officers, group 1 (2LT-CPT) (Table 20). The senior commissioned officers exhibited less emotional exhaustion,

thus the higher numbers in the low and moderate ranges of burnout.

Table 20
Reported Emotional Exhaustion and Burnout Level of Military Personnel by Rank (Percentage and Total)

	2LT-CPT	MAJ-COL
Low	21.7% (5)	56% (31)
Moderate	56.5% (13)	33% (18)
High	21.7% (5)	11% (6)

The senior commissioned officers also reported lower scores in depersonalization, (Table 21) which equated to a low level of burnout. In the low level of burnout, 73% of the senior commissioned officers compared to 39% of the younger officers feel low levels of depersonalization and hence, a low level of burnout.

On the other hand, 26% of the younger officers reported high levels of depersonalization equating to a high level of burnout. Senior officers in comparison reported 11% in the high burnout level of depersonalization.

High levels of personal accomplishment were reported by both senior and junior officers (Table 22). These high levels equate to low levels of burnout. The junior officers reported a greater percentage, 57%, than the senior officers' percentage of 53%.

Table 21 Reported Depersonalization and Burnout Level of Military Personnel by Rank (Percentage and Total)		
	2LT-CPT	MAJ-COL
Low	39% (9)	73% (40)
Moderate	35% (8)	16% (9)
High	26% (6)	11% (6)

However, in the high level of burnout caused by low levels of personal accomplishment, senior officers again reported having fewer incidents of high levels of burnout. The younger officers, having reported greater feelings or incidents of low personal accomplishment, thus reported more incidents of high burnout.

Table 22 Reported Personal Accomplishment and Burnout Level of Military Personnel by Rank (Percentage and Total)		
	2LT-CPT	MAJ-COL
Low	57% (13)	53% (29)
Moderate	17% (4)	33% (18)
High	26% (6)	14% (8)

Chapter 5

Summary and Interpretation

With the information received from the public affairs officers, can this research question be answered: *Because of inadequate or incomplete training, less autonomy, added stress of military commitments, and less job satisfaction, do commissioned public affairs officers, show more instances of job burnout than Department of the Army civilian serving in Army public affairs positions?*

This research showed that public affairs officers, both military and civilian, exhibited a moderate level of burnout. The two groups differed only slightly on the various subscales. The major difference between the groups was the military reported high levels of emotional exhaustion whereas the civilians reported high levels of depersonalization.

For the purposes of this research, acceptance or rejection of the research hypotheses was based on percentages and numbers of reported levels of the job burnout syndrome. The overall intent was to show whether the target population exhibited signs of the syndrome, compare these numbers to numbers obtained from other professions and to make comparisons among the subgroups of the target population.

The first hypothesis, *Commissioned officers and Department of the Army civilians, serving in Army public affairs positions, will exhibit some level of job burnout as defined by the Maslach Burnout Inventory*, was accepted because the population of public affairs officers, on the average, exhibited a moderate level of job burnout. Burnout is a people-related syndrome. In other words, those personnel whose work puts them into great contact with people, care-givers, and teachers for instance, will exhibit higher levels of job burnout.

Strictly speaking, the military is not like other people-related professions; however, public affairs deals with people, recipients, specifically. This relationship with people and people issues could be a major contributing factor to the moderate level of burnout and the similarities when compared to the burnout levels of other groups more often associated with caring for and dealing with people.

The great amount of personal accomplishment reported by the public affairs officers relates to getting the job done and having some impact on the outside, non-public affairs, population. By either producing a newspaper, or magazine, these public affairs personal feel they have done something vital for their community.

Hypothesis two, *Commissioned officers serving in Army public affairs positions will exhibit more job burnout than Department of the Army civilians*, was rejected because the

military did not exhibit an overwhelming amount of job burnout when compared to the civilians. However, there was a key difference in the scores reported for emotional exhaustion and depersonalization that showed a dramatic difference in how the military and civilians view their jobs and the work environment.

Commissioned officers reported a greater percentage of high level burnout in the depersonalization subscale. An employee with feelings of depersonalization can be described as impersonal, callous, hard, lacking compassion, and having feelings of being blamed for problems within the office (30).

Feelings of depersonalization result from negative perceptions, real or imagined, of recipients, fellow workers, and associates. As one officer stated, it is very frustrating when recipients and associates, supervisors and leaders who work in the division and installation command group and "do not understand PA, and are unreceptive to education about it" **Survey 047** (Military).

Another commissioned officer pointed out the frustration felt by not being part of the team and not receiving positive recognition:

> The general feeling among most public affairs officers I know is that unless you are a combat arms officer, working for the chief of staff at Division-level is tough and you stand very little chance of getting a fair evaluation regardless of how well you do. Very tough, demanding job with very few pats on the back **Survey 068** (Military).

Civilians, on the other hand, reported a greater percentage of high level burnout in the emotional exhaustion subscale. A person who is emotionally exhausted reports feelings of being drained, used up, fatigued, burned out, frustrated, stressed, and being at the end of their rope (Maslach 30).

One civilian reported loving her profession but still feeling great frustration with the environment and her co-workers.

> Although I love my job because of my contact with people and because I'm using my college training, working for the Army as a civilian woman poses quite a challenge. There are many many high ranking officers who don't believe women should have positions of authority, and they don't take women seriously. Many are prejudiced against civilians to begin with, so being a civilian woman makes it pretty difficult at times **Survey 013** (Civilian).

She reported a great amount of frustration, as did many other civilians, because they were not being employed properly and were not treated like the military. Their frustration is a reaction to how they are supervised. Additional frustration stems from antagonism and possible disrespect from co-workers, civilian and military.

> One disappointment I have had in working for the Army is that civilians are not treated as equals and are looked down upon by soldiers. The attitude is that we are "9 to 5'ers" while they are soldiers 24 hours a day. It causes resentment. I was disappointed that we often are not considered part of the 'team' **Survey 013** (Civilian).

Hypothesis three, *Army public affairs officers, both*

military and civilian, will exhibit job burnout similar to that of human service employees, and educators, was accepted because the public affairs officers, military and civilian, exhibited levels of job burnout similar to that of other groups listed in Table 18.

The public affairs officers reported lower levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization than did most of the other groups. This is most likely a result of their people-related jobs being less people oriented than, for instance a teacher's or a health care provider's job. Public affairs officers come into a great deal of contact with both military and non-military personnel but not to the extent and duration of personnel in the comparison groups.

When compared to health care personnel and teachers, public affairs personnel report less personal accomplishment. Whereas public affairs personnel do have an influence on their small society, consisting of military, and Department of the Army civilian personnel, and family members, it is an indirect influence. Health care personnel and teachers have a direct influence on their recipients and can immediately see the effects.

Hypothesis four, *Commissioned officers with more time in service and more training, who are serving in Army public affairs positions, will exhibit less job burnout than officers with less training and fewer years in service*, was accepted because the group of senior commissioned officers,

when compared to younger commissioned officers, reported experiencing a greater percentage of lower-levels job burnout: lower emotional exhaustion, lower depersonalization, and greater personal accomplishment.

The senior commissioned officers having more maturity, greater experience in both military and public affairs, more education both formal and informal, and having learned how to cope and survive, reported a greater percentage of low level burnout in the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization subscales.

Younger officers, still learning how to be commissioned officers, reported greater feelings of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. While the senior officers know where they stand in the military structure, the younger officers are only beginning to learn their place. Without the self-assuredness and knowing that come with age and experience, the younger officers learn by making mistakes and following examples. Starting at the bottom can lead to feelings of callousness and burnout.

However, the younger officers did exhibit a high level of personal accomplishment. The younger officers are eager to please their leaders and co-workers. The newness of their experiences makes everything a challenge. Once the challenge has been accepted and completed the younger officers take pride in the newly learned skills.

Almost as important and vital to this research, as were

the answers to the Maslach Burnout Inventory, were the sincere answers volunteered by the respondents. Most of the responses were anonymous; however several public affairs officers identified themselves and provided information they felt would assist the research and their fellow public affairs officers.

The survey's open-ended question was answered by 27% of the military and 34% of the civilian respondents. Of the respondents who answered the open-ended question, 69% (46) were civilian and 31% (21) were military. Many civilians and military personnel reported frustration, feelings of being second class, and disenchantment with Army public affairs training, supervision, and command.

It was beyond the scope of this research to categorize the responses and/or conduct a content analysis. The overall response rate of 31%, though more than expected, was not great enough to provide a true picture of the target population's perceptions. However, the responses added to the body of information and describe the situations and emotions surrounding the syndrome of job burnout.

Frustration, felt by both military and civilians working within the selected Army public affairs offices, was the subject of many responses. Public affairs officers described how they felt and perceived the day-to-day workings of Army public affairs both inside and outside of the office. Their frustration resulted from the misuse of

public affairs personnel, and treatment as nonintegral parts of the team.

> No matter how competent and dedicated, the average civilian who does not fit one of several special categories (prior military service, Reserve status, marriage to a senior officer) is always a second-class citizen. By the time civilians reach mid-career, they usually have more experience than the officers who supervise them, but this is not always taken into account **Survey 024** (Civilian).

The frustration came from outside the office as well. As discussed earlier, military personnel have an adversarial relationship with both the press and public affairs officers. As public affairs officers strive to maintain credibility with the press and gain the respect of their military superiors there is cause for great frustration.

> Public Affairs people, military and civilian, get very little respect from intermediate staff members and chiefs-of-staff.
> . . . to paraphrase George Patton, commanders don't know what public affairs is, but they want some. We lose credibility by not being where we are needed **Survey 067** (Military).

The same holds true for the many civilians who responded. Civilian public affairs officers must prove themselves and the worth of their profession to personnel who see public affairs as merely an interference to normal operations.

> Civilians are treated badly much of the time. Commanders do not use their assets in a smart fashion. Staff and non PAO types interfere with proper PAO functions to the extent of contradicting Regulation, Policy and giving Commanders bad info **Survey 152** (Civilian).

Many of the respondents were highly critical of the

state of training and the quality of military public affairs course graduates. Several of the respondents have served many years with government and in the public affairs field. Their responses reflect a disenchantment with public affairs training for both military and civilian personnel and assignment policies.

> My greatest concern is the Army's practice of assigning officers as PAOs who may or may not have the ability to be so. Commanders tend to use their PAO slots unwisely.
>
> Another big concern is that civilian training is so haphazard-I for instance, haven't been able to go to PAOC and etc. because of money. This profession requires its technicians [and] practitioners to be continually trained and their knowledge refreshed **Survey 136** (Civilian).

Military public affairs training, ongoing and initial, is vital to refresh veteran professionals and to initiate those with little or no prior public affairs training respectively. A majority of the population, 152, 71%, have attended and graduated from the Public Affairs Officer Course. However, the number of personnel, military and civilian, who have graduated from advanced military public affairs training is extremely low.

Even with the military public affairs training, basic and advanced, many public affairs officers believe the courses do not produce the best public affairs officers possible. "The PA officers course focused heavily on how to get fired, not how to promote the Army story" **Survey 044** (Military). Additionally, most ". . . officers who become PAOs have no real interest in public affairs, and certainly

no training other than the public affairs course, and it shows" **Survey 186** (Civilian).

Several respondents stated there was a need for a change in the curriculum if graduates are to do the job Army leaders require of them. Of those who held this belief, they voiced their opinions in strong language. "The key to developing trained and talented PAOs is raising the level of education/training at DINFOS. To put it mildly - it stunk in 1983 and it stinks just as bad in 1993" **Survey 091** (Military).

Placing inexperienced, improperly trained, and unmotivated officers into key public affairs positions of authority and responsibility can reflect poorly on everyone involved and associated with the office and public affairs in general.

> After 20 years of experience at all levels of DOD, DA MACOM, and tactical public affairs, the level of stress and the command's lack of understanding of the critical role of the PAO, especially at the unit/installation level, is appalling.
>
> Such misunderstandings, coupled by relative inexperience of commissioned officers and their entry grade as PAOs, fosters unhealthy relationships and undermines PAO credibility; results negatively impact on the quality of life for PAO soldiers **Survey 143** (Civilian).

Finally, loyalty is a major factor in a smooth running and effective operation or office. Intense loyalty, devotion to duty, and honor make military personnel and Department of the Army civilians operate as part of the combat arms team. These feelings of deep devotion to duty and loyalty can and

have changed due to tremendous frustration.

> Too bad the Army doesn't care whether it keeps dedicated, experienced employees or not. Up until a year ago, I would have laid down my life for my country. But the Army has destroyed that kind of loyalty. It cares little for civilians **Survey 172** (Civilian).

Future Research

Further research should be conducted to learn if enlisted journalists and editors, in the pay grades E1 through E9, suffer from job burnout. Comparisons could then be made between the burnout of civilians, commissioned officers, and enlisted personnel.

Follow-up research based on Soucy and Kelly's research, role conflict and perceptions of commanders, should be conducted to learn more about the relationship between Army public affairs officers and their supervisors/leaders.

Research should be conducted to determine the long-term effects of job burnout, and if there is any relationship between gender and job burnout.

Other research could look into the possible causes and contributing factors of job burnout. Specifically, researchers should use instruments such as the Work Environment Scale to collect information about conditions within public affairs offices.

Longitudinal research should be conducted to collect information over a period of months or years. Possible research could investigate those public affairs offices about to change supervisors or other personnel to make

comparisons between personalities and leadership styles.

Appendices

A. Instruction Letter

Dear Participant,

This survey is being administered as partial fulfillment of the graduation requirements associated with a masters degree in journalism at Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia. By completing this survey packet, you will assist me in learning some of the job-related attitudes of commissioned officers and Department of the Army civilians serving in Army Public Affairs positions.

Results of this survey may be used to assist commanders to better employ Public Affairs personnel.

Participation in this research is voluntary and you will remain anonymous. It should take you no more than 15 to 20 minutes to complete the survey. After completing the survey, place it in the return envelope and mail it directly to me.

The survey packet contains a Human Services Survey, a demographic questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope.

When completing the Human Services Survey, please follow the instructions on the survey. It is critical that you answer every question. In several questions, the survey utilizes the term "recipient." For this survey, the term "recipient" refers to "the people with whom you work or come

into contact daily, inside and outside of the office."

When answering the Demographic Questionnaire, please answer as thoroughly as possible and provide any comments you wish in the space provided.

Thank you for your help and time.

B. Demographic Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions.

1. Age. _____

2. Sex. Male _____ Female _____

3. Rank or GS level. _____

4. Years in government service. _____

5. Years in Public Affairs. _____

6. Military Public Affairs training. (Check all applicable answers.)

__ The Basic Army Public Affairs Officer Course

__ The Senior Public Affairs Officer Course

__ Training with Industry

__ The Army Advanced Public Affairs Course

__ The Cooperative Degree Program

__ The Degree on the Installment Plan

__ The Fully-Funded Graduate Degree Program

__ On-the-Job

__ Other (specify)_____

7. (Military only) Branch of the Army. _____

8. (Military only) Did you request Public Affairs as a functional area? Yes_____ No _____

9. Undergraduate major and degree.

_____

10. Graduate major and degree.

_____

11. Do you plan to leave Army Public Affairs within the next 5 years? Yes_____ No _____

12. If you plan to leave Army Public Affairs, what field or position will you enter?

13. How many hours a week do you work at the job indicated above? _____ hours per week.

14. How many personnel are you directly responsible for? _____ personnel.

Use the following numerical code to answer the questions below:

1 - strongly disagree; 2 - disagree; 3 - neither agree nor disagree; 4 - agree; 5 - strongly agree

I am satisfied with my work.	1	2	3	4	5
I am working in the kind of job I wanted when I entered government service.	1	2	3	4	5
Army Public Affairs is different from what I expected.	1	2	3	4	5
If I had to do it all over, I would still choose to work in Army Public Affairs.	1	2	3	4	5

Once you have completed the Human Services Survey, and demographic questionnaire, please use the space below to provide any additional comments or observations.

C. Sample Letter of Introduction

30 June 1993

7th INFANTRY DIVISION (LIGHT) AND FORT ORD
ATTN: AFZW-PO
FORT ORD, CA 93941-5000

Dear Public Affairs Officer,

I am enrolled in the W. Page Pitt School of Journalism and Mass Communications at Marshall University in Huntington, West Virginia and currently working through the Fully-Funded Graduate Degree Program to earn my Master's degree.

Your support is vital in completing the enclosed survey packets, which will become the basis of my master's thesis to be completed before the end of August 1993. I have enclosed 8 survey packets; each containing one Human Services Survey, a demographic questionnaire, and a return envelope.

Please complete a survey packet and distribute the other packets to the Commissioned Officers and Department of the Army civilians in your office or under your supervision. Completion time for a survey packet is 15 to 20 minutes.

You and the other survey participants will remain completely anonymous. Participation in this project is strictly voluntary. After each individual completes the survey packet, he or she should return it to me using the attached return envelope.

Copies of the completed thesis will be forwarded to the Office of the Chief of Public Affairs, and to the Marshall University library.

Your assistance and support of this project are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

D. Responses to Open-Ended Question

Of 215 respondents from the target population, 67, 31%, chose to respond to the open-ended question at the end of the demographic questionnaire. The question, "Once you have completed the Human Services Survey, and demographic questionnaire, please use the space below to provide any additional comments or observations," generated the following responses.

Survey 001 (Civilian)

The key to my satisfaction and the success of the magazine is the outstanding support of the chain of command--starting with the CGs (three of them, to date). We are not micromanaged; we are not controlled or censored. They (the chain) work on our behalf (vis a vis) the field/soldier. The needs of the field are # one -- to all of us.

Survey 007 (Civilian)

Your questionnaire is tainted--I don't think any legitimate data can be acquired from this set of questions.

Survey 013 (Civilian)

Although I love my job because of my contact with people and because I'm using my college training, working for the Army as a civilian woman poses quite a challenge. There are many many high ranking officers who don't believe women should have positions of authority, and they don't take women seriously. Many are prejudiced against civilians to begin with, so being a civilian woman makes it pretty difficult at times. In my current position I am in charge of media relations, but when a big event happens I am not allowed to be the spokesperson for t.v., a uniformed member (usually my boss the PAO) must do the interview. I am, however, allowed to do radio and newspaper interviews. I have often wondered why the Army chooses to put civilians in some of the media slots and then fails to use them fully. I understand that a uniformed spokesperson is desirable especially for t.v., so perhaps all slots should be military.

One disappointment I have had in working for the Army is that civilians are not treated as equals and are looked down upon by soldiers. The attitude is that we are "9 to 5'ers" while they are soldiers 24 hours a day. It causes resentment. I consider it a matter of choice. If I wanted to join the Army I would have and if soldiers wanted 9 to 5 jobs, they could have stayed out of the Army. I was

disappointed that we often are not considered part of the "team."

I would like to add that I do feel I make a contribution. I'm able to talk to the media and the community and translate difficult to understand Army-talk. I believe in the Army and am proud of the soldiers who, for the most part, are dedicated. I also love my job when I feel I've helped someone. Good luck with your project!

Survey 017 (Civilian)

I could have benefitted from the formal PA training at an earlier stage. It didn't begin coming until 13 years after I entered the career field, and has all taken place during my 20 years in this office.

Survey 018 (Military)

Public Affairs is a worthwhile, challenging line of work.

Good luck with your Masters!

Survey 024 (Civilian)

Thanks for the opportunity to participate in your survey.

I'd like to make a few comments.

Army Public Affairs per se is not a bad career field. I've had some great jobs and have been very happy in them. As my responses show, that is not now the case.

But rather than go into the specifics of my situation, I offer you the following general comments:

* A career in Army PA becomes less satisfying for civilians as they attain seniority. No matter how competent and dedicated, the average civilian who does not fit one of several special categories (prior military service, Reserve status, marriage to a senior officer) is always a second-class citizen. By the time civilians reach mid-career, they usually have more experience than the officers who supervise them, but this is not always taken into account. The best assignments and the managerial positions go to the military personnel, while the civilians experience diminished responsibility and challenge. This is especially true in higher headquarters. Also, as civilians attain seniority, their career options become limited. They often end up spending the last ten or more years of their

careers in the same job. If it's a good job, that's fine. If it's a bad job, the military who work with them move on, but the civilians are forced to stay for years.

* Military supervisors do not understand the civilian system. They complain, for example, that civilians are eligible for cash awards while military personnel are not. As I commented to one officer, I'll trade my eligibility for cash awards for your housing allowance any day. I make more than some officers in gross income, but by the time housing, medical care, and other benefits are factored in, most officers make more than senior civilians. Both military and civilian PA personnel need to understand and respect each other's systems and remember that each group has special advantages and drawbacks.

* Public Affairs Officers' primary challenge is to win the respect and confidence of the military leaders they serve. Far too often, the PAO is the junior member of the staff. He/she must work much harder than the average staff officer to convince the command group that the PA staff has a vital role in the overall effectiveness of the organization.

* The career track of an enlisted public affairs specialist is dismal. Here's what usually happens: A young soldier starts out as a journalist. He's bright, creative, and enthusiastic. If he does well, he becomes an editor. Then, between grade E-5 and E-7, he finds himself the senior enlisted person in his office. This means he's expected to be a general office manager and dogsbody for everyone. There is often little or no outlet for the creativity and talent that made him excel and attain rank in the first place, and he lacks the training and the temperament for the new role he is expected to play. At this stage, the best NCOs often leave. The ones who stay suffer some of the same problems as senior civilians -- diminished responsibility, lack of respect for years of experience, fewer challenges, and burnout. I can count on the fingers of one hand the senior NCOs I know who have maintained their edge and remained at least relatively happy in the last years of their careers.

Survey 025 (Military)

Since the arrival of the new PAO, work environment is less personable and more frustrating. A desire to flood the system with unneed[ed] paperwork and a lack of personal relationships (every military person is (Rank, Name; not 1st name) has contributed to a tense environment.

Survey 027 (Civilian)

I've always loved to write, but I think it took me too long to get into my field. I spent more than 7 years out of 10 doing other low GS jobs completely unrelated to my BA degree. Once I got here, I excelled. I also feel that work load is not very well balanced. Some journalists produce 1/3 as much work on a regular basis. The journalists with a strong work ethic are taken advantage of and the lazy ones are not pushed hard enough.

At first the work environment was terrible but all the terrible people went away and now it's much better. The people who used to be here used vulgar language and it made the work environment uncomfortable for me. So I showed the supervisor the regulation, and everyone was angry with me because they had to clean-up their mouth. But now the new set of people are great to work with and they respect me a lot because I work very hard and do great work.

Public speaking makes me a better writer because I get a better feel for the reading audience. I think all PAO people should be required to join Toastmasters.

Survey 030 (Military)

I enjoy my work. It is difficult though to jump to the demands of the CG, Div staff, Installation staff and BDE Cdrs-

Being subordinate to every LTC on the installation is difficult and frustrating.

Survey 032 (Civilian)

Sometimes it is not the job or the field you are working in; but supervisors who have become entrenched in their jobs and with the command who feel they can do no wrong and everything will be their way.

Survey 035 (Civilian)

This is a great survey.

Survey 037 (Civilian)

Pursuant to the last question on the "demographic" sheet:

If I had to do it all over again, I would still seek work in public affairs; just not ARMY public affairs.

Unfortunately, by the time I came to believe that I had too many years in Civil Service. Because I entered under the old CSRS (Civil Service Retirement System,) I am not vested in the retirement fund. If I had quit at that time, all the years of retirement contributions would have been lost to me [this is not the case under the current FERS (Federal Employees Retirement System)]. Thus, I chose to stay on. However, I have, from time to time, attempted to migrate to another federal agency i.e. DOE, EPA, Parks Department, etc) without success due to vacancies being filled from within those agencies (a policy I do not disagree with.)

Having reread that paragraph, I hasten to add that I have not "retired in place." I believe, and my performance ratings bear this out, that I am doing more than what's required; I am still dedicated to the job, and to the importance of public affairs in the public sector. I believe in it: I don't believe, any more, that the Army does.

My biggest frustrations with Army PA are:

Civilian sector organizations recognize more of the importance of PA. Probably because they can see the effects on the "bottom line" when things go wrong. The Army can occasionally get bad media reports, but it can also live through it. (The worst reports of the Vietnam War lasted 6 to 8 years, depending on what/when you started counting.) Afterwards, the Army will spend a while touting the importance of PA, but no real changes get effected. Why, after Desert Storm was DOD so surprised to find media waiting on the beach in Somalia? In the planning, despite lessons learned from DS, PA was not considered all that important. And those two events were not that far apart in time (or distance.) I don't believe civilian agencies would have been that myopic.

Civilian sector organizations -- profit and non-profit -- and even some public sector organizations such as state agencies will provide more assistance to employees for professional development. This can range from funding for simple things like business cards to paying for employee memberships in professional organizations like PRSA, and PRSA is not cheap, even on a GS-12 salary. I do understand that this is not always the Army's decision, but where they do have some latitude, like funded degree programs, civilians are generally excluded from participation.

Now for the one that grates on me particularly. In the Army, the civilian PA professional will almost never be the boss. Army "downsizes" dontcha just love that word.) If I

became the senior ranking PA civilian in the Army at Office, Chief of Public Affairs, I would still be the "Deputy," never the "Chief." There are a few places of exception like Natick Labs or Tank-Automotive Command or Communications Electronics Command. But in these, like Corps of Engineers, the command is 80 percent or more civilian anyway, and, with the exception of COE, they are not even MACOMS.

I say all this because I entered the Army PA program on a vision of the future that never materialized. I was the second person to enter the FORSCOM Intern program in 1973. (The first intern is no longer in federal service by the way.) The program was just born and promised much in the way of training and developmental assignments. As you can see from my survey, I did get some of the training, including the Advanced Course when it was still at the University of Wisconsin. I have already applied 3 times and have a fourth application in for the Army Management Staff College (the civilian's equivalent of C&GS.) My first three applications were in USAREUR; and during one of those I saw a USAREUR CPO memo that stated garrison XOs, Resource Management and Logistics Management applications would be accepted first. If and only if, slots were left unfilled would others (including PA) be forwarded. Yet, it is my contention that the PA needs more than anyone to be versed in the Army management principles, as he or she will be the one to explain, clarify and even justify management decisions to the public.

Also, I was not selected for two openings of a civilian garrison XO. While I certainly do not feel that I should be selected for any particular job; I truly do believe that my credentials were equal to one and certainly better than the other persons actually selected. I am not convinced that the selectors in the case felt a PAO, by nature, was equipped; both selectees were from Resource Management. Another XO position for which I did not apply was also filled with an RM. I absolutely feel that an XO's job is not just about money. That job is much broader than that. I also feel that of any one on an installation, no person is involved in all the activities of the post as much as the PAO. There is no aspect of the running of an installation to which the PAO will not be involved sometime in his or her career. Yet, I am convinced that you or I will never see a (civilian) PAO selected for one of the (civilian) garrison XO openings. We are not viewed as "managers." For some of this I hold DA public affairs accountable. It is my contention that DA PA desperately needs to be made a "Directorate" organization and finally get away from being a commander's "Special Staff." It is unfathomable to me why we haven't at least become a "General (G-)staff" organization in the last 50 some odd years. I don't feel

that OCPA has ever given any more than lip service to fighting for this change.

While I have gotten promotions, advancing from a GS-5 intern to a GS-12 Deputy Corps PAO, I have not had the luxury of moving about in truly developmental assignments. During my career I have had the opportunity to work in: straight public affairs, marketing and advertising (Recruiting) and Host Nations Relations (USAREUR.) But the strict adherence of the Army to TDA manning levels prevents overhires and excesses for civilians. So going to Corps of Engineers for a year, say, is not permissible. With the introduction of "Managing Civilians to Budget" (MCB) this is even less likely.

Survey 038 (Civilian)

Americans have the ability to perform jobs in many areas that they feel unqualified. In the Army, for instance, a person will be assigned a job in which they have had little or no experience but with the proper attitude they learn a new skill and enjoy the work. Point being, flexibility is important.

I would also say that depending on the managerial skills of the boss, that the same person with the same job would fill out this survey completely opposite depending upon if the boss had a dictatorial vs. a persuasive managerial style.

Survey 040 (Civilian)

Here are the Human Services Survey answers from when I worked for (ex-supervisor's name): 6, 6, 6, 6, 4, 3, 5, 6, 5, 3, 5, 2, 6, 6, 4, 3, 6, 5, 5, 6, 5, 2. Life is better now. [These responses equate to high (48) EE, high (20) DP, and low (39) PA. Respondent scored 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 5, 2, 5, 2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 1, 2, 6, 5, 5, 2, 3, 1 on the original Human Services Survey submitted for the survey. This score equates to: Moderate (20) EE, moderate (9) DP, and low (39) PA.]

Survey 044 (Military)

The PA officers course focused heavily on how to get fired, not how to promote the Army story.

Survey 047 (Military)

My "recipients" are senior officers, i.e., Division and installation command group. I believe in this business, but it is incredibly frustrating. The root of much of this

frustration is:

1-"Recipients" who do not understand PA and are unreceptive to education about it.

2-"Recipients" who have no sense of responsibility for telling their part of the Army story.

3-Lack of effective PA "network," e.g., regular PAO conferences; a real professional journal; a mentor program; system for disseminating info, good ideas, lessons learned, etc.

4-Continuous downsizing of PAO organization, incoherent/inconsistent MTOEs/TDAs...lack of resources to accomplish an important mission.

Survey 050 (Civilian)

Too many people think they are government "journalists" when in fact they are "PR" types. We do not practice journalism and shouldn't.

Survey 058 (Military)

Although my responses are somewhat negative, and reflect a great deal of stress, most of the difficulties center around frustration more than anything else.

Initially, I had no desire to serve in Public Affairs but have since learned the value of PAOs to the command. I have learned a great deal over the past three and look forward to future PAO assignments. However, as a CPT in my first PAO assignment, I think it is imperative that the 46 assignment officer insist on new officers being assigned to installation and MACOM levels first. This is a critical period of growth for the new PAO and will go a long way in developing confidence and competence. It is a mistake to do otherwise!

The frustration I mentioned earlier deals with trying to change staff officers and commanders opinions about PAOs. Proving to them we're not the enemy. Then again, trying to break these stereotypes makes our job exciting to say the least.

Survey 059 (Military)

Keep in mind that I just started working in Army Public Affairs and this is my first experience with it. I absolutely love it already and think I will continue to like it.

Survey 060 (Civilian)

Most frustrating part of working Public Affairs is the bureaucratic mindset of some subject matter experts and commanders.

Survey 062 (Military)

Human services survey makes no sense. This survey should have been written to fit the PA field.

Survey 063 (Civilian)

I am very satisfied with my Army public affairs career. I find it to be rewarding and always exciting.

Survey 064 (Military)

It's a tremendously rewarding career, one in which we have the opportunity to influence people's views and opinions of the Army.

Survey 067 (Military)

Public Affairs people, military and civilian, get very little respect from intermediate staff members and chiefs-of-staff. Senior commanders (post/division) have usually been through the general officer's charm school, where they are taught what PAOs do and how they can help. However, getting proposals through gatekeepers to the decision makers generally degenerates into headbutting contests.

Second, when we deploy, no one thinks about having us on the ground until the lead commander is waist-deep in reporters. By the time, PAO gets room on an aircraft, it's well into the operation and too late. By that point, to paraphrase George Patton, commanders don't know what public affairs is, but they want some. We lose credibility by not being where we are needed.

Survey 068 (Military)

The general feeling among most public affairs officers I know is that unless you are a combat arms officer, working for the chief of staff at Division-level is tough and you stand very little chance of getting a fair evaluation regardless of how well you do. Very tough, demanding job with very few pats on the back.

Survey 070 (Military)

It's not so much the job as it is the type of Division, lack of understanding of PA by senior/major commanders and the lack of common sense among those with whom I work.

Survey 074 (Military)

I would not trade my 20 years in the Army for all the gold in Fort Knox!!

My wife and I have had a wonderful career!

Good Luck on your degree work!

Survey 075 (Civilian)

Having been associated with the Army most of my life (Army brat, Army wife-now "retired" wife), I'm surprised and concerned by apparent indifference of military-at least in garrison-to the need for prioritization, evaluation, and standardization. This indifference is everywhere, from the immediate work situation to the highest levels. "Do more with less" and even "do everything with nothing" are SOP; a genuinely laughable mindset in view of continued budget and personnel cuts. My contention is that if my particular public affairs office were a civilian business, it would last about 3 days. The concern and time lavished on minutiae is awe-inspiring. The time spent adjusting to three DPAOs and six PAOs running the place over the last 9 years (and the energy dissipated in "switching gears" continually) is ridiculous. The unwillingness or inability to acquire the simplest, most basic tools to do the job (not to mention modern technology to increase efficiency) is frustrating. But hey, this job pays the bills. The salary is the sole compensation!

Survey 076 (Civilian)

From 1979-1990, I was enlisted in Public Affairs. In 1991, I became an officer in the National Guard and chose Military Intelligence as my branch. As a civilian, I work PAO on a full-time basis.

Survey 078 (Civilian)

Biggest cause of stress and dissatisfaction is diminishing resources with no corresponding decrease in mission. For example, in the last two years both my secretary and administrative deputy positions were abolished. Most of my overtime-unpaid-is spent doing

administrative routine things I cannot task to anyone else. For this, I give up time I should be with family.

Survey 086 (Civilian)

The survey seemed to have a predisposition toward "burnout" behavior- Do employees who have it-recognize it? I found Maslach/Jackson to have questions/answers that go to extremes of Bell curve-not the middle ground. Ugh!

1. Glad to assist you in your graduate school project.

(I have been there myself !!!)

2. Of interest to me was the focus of the survey appeared to be behavior of personnel in Army public Affairs offices and NOT the causes of it.

3. I think a lot could be gained by studying the (apparent) causes of the expressed (repressed??) behavior. A study might show these factors include:

-- Poor working environment.
-- Obsolete (lack of) equipment.
-- Employees/supervisors with weak skills.
-- Complex regulatory environment.
-- Bureaucratic structure.

4. My experience has been that enthusiastic workers tend to find ways to overcome these type factors ... other workers, however, adopt less than satisfactory behavior and work performance in direct proportion to them.

5, Well, there is always the next survey ...

Survey 091 (Military)

The key to developing trained and talented PAOs is raising the level of education/training at DINFOS. To put it mildly- it stunk in 1983 and it stinks just as bad in 1993.

Survey 094 (Civilian)

I am not entirely satisfied with some of my current duties on this job.

Survey 096 (Civilian)

The individual who is the Public Affairs Officer really affects the tempo and attitude of the people in the office and how they do their job.

Survey 107 (Military)

I spent over twenty years in the field artillery. I think that experience has helped me to be a better PAO. I believe every PAO should serve in another branch for two or three years minimum before being selected for assignment to a PAO position.

While I consider myself to be effective and efficient as a PAO, I am glad I spent most of my career in a combat arms branch.

Survey 108 (Civilian)

I don't like question #21--asking for two things here which may or may not go together. Not all problems are emotional; not always dealt with calmly on a basis to be measured daily.

Also, how I deal with people as a Public Affairs Specialist depends on which branch of Public Affairs I'm working in.

Survey 110 (Civilian)

Good luck with your project. Will the results be published and available to the Army PA community?

Survey 117 (Civilian)

Most of the frustration experienced in my present position are not PAO related result from working in any government bureaucracy.

Survey 118 (Civilian)

At this point in my career, my opinion of Army PA is taking a serious turning point. I am changing from the most enthusiastic, energetic, devoted and dedicated PA specialist in the field to a disbeliever. [Deleted due to personal nature] I shall take early retirement. The Army no longer needs me.

Survey 121 (Military)

OCS officer, former SSG, retire 1 Dec 93.

I've been in Media Relations too long.

JIB in Dhahran really burned me out working with liberal, left-wing journalists is the pits, however, being able to influence public perception (positively of course)

about my Army is very satisfying.

Survey 123 (Civilian)

People that have negative attitudes tend to criticize everything and only want to do "their" jobs. They do not reach out to others and never offer any assistance. Negative folks like to find fault with the "workers" and the "pleasant" people within an office. They can cause office morale problems more than one realizes.

Keep a mature attitude with "negative" types, keep a sense of humor-and keep a fun happy life for yourself after duty hours with great friends.

Survey 127 (Civilian)

Many answers are based on medical problems--I have not always felt that way--I love the public affairs field.

Survey 129 (Civilian)

With civilianization of Army Public Affairs, more care must be made to educate commanders. We civilians, are primary PA people and experienced. Many Army officers are not. And certainly don't get experienced with one ten week Army PA course.

Survey 136 (Civilian)

I was in civilian print journalism before I entered the Army as a military journalist, then stayed with the Army Public Affairs system as a GS. My greatest concern is the Army's practice of assigning officers as PAOs who may or may not have the ability to be so. Commanders tend to use their PAO slots unwisely. The Marine Corps is the [] about this-their PAOs are warrant officers who are professional journalists, technical advisors who have more qualifications than merely attending the PAOC.

Another big concern is that civilian training is so haphazard-I for instance, haven't been able to go to PAOC and etc. because of money. This profession requires it technicians/practitioners to be continually trained and their knowledge refreshed. Others who can go to school because their commands can "give up" the money have an advantage civs who cannot.

All in all, neither are very professional ways to "conduct business."

Survey 139 (Military)

I would like to be in a PAO position or TOE unit rather than my current job. There are not many things I enjoy or find rewarding about this job. I would rather be a "doer." Right now, I plan to get back to the Artillery ASAP. I may stay in PA if I could go overseas as a PAO then to an Arty unit while I'm there. Your human services survey form does not seem quite applicable to my job. I tried to look at recipients as all the folks I coordinate with (and others).

Survey 142 (Civilian)

My job is not strictly public affairs, but magazine production as managing editor. One of my favorite aspects of the job, however is dealing with people and being in the "field" covering exercises and events.

Survey 143 (Military)

Army Public Affairs should create a Warrant Officer position to strengthen media relations, command information, and battlefield PAO support. Warrant Officers would be ideal in Public Affairs/Information Detachments.

Army Public Affairs has a small number of Dual Component Officers (AR 600-39) who are subject to mobilization as public affairs officers. These individuals serve in RA enlisted grades while concurrently holding USAR warrants or commissions.

Army Public Affairs NCOs represent a highly-educated and experienced pool of personnel who should be given greater responsibilities and relied upon to a higher degree by commissioned public affairs officers. In fact, Army Public Affairs is probably the lowest density Career Management Field in the Army with the highest percentage of college graduates.

The combination of special skills, talents, and education should be put to greater use and higher standards.

After 20 years of experience at all levels of DOD, DA MACOM, and Tactical public affairs, the level of stress and the command's lack of understanding of the critical role of the PAO, especially at the unit/installation level, is appalling.

Such misunderstandings, coupled by relative inexperience of commissioned officers and their entry grade as PAOs, fosters unhealthy relationships and undermines PAO credibility; results negatively impact on the quality of

life for PAO soldiers.

All services have the authority to commission Limit Duty Officers (See USMC) as PAOs. LDOs are similar to Warrant Officers and given highly specialized duties. The possibilities of LDOs should be explored for more proper utilization of PAO assets and abilities, to increase career opportunities, etc.

Survey 145 (Civilian)

My qualms are these:

1. Poor quality of graduates from the Army's Defense Information courses.

2. The far less than adequate training DINFOS grads get in Media Relations, which is my field.

3. The extreme lack of support Media Relations receives in adequately staffing the section-rejects from other PAO sections, members of Public Affairs Detachments who are too busy to do MR work or people with bad attitudes or who do not know how to relate to media.

4. Military members who refuse to cooperate with media due to pre-conceived notions concerning the press.

Survey 147 (Military)

I love Public Affairs, its the restrictions that my chain of command puts on us that make me frustrated and ruin my job. We in the PAO are being micromanaged. It is taking us too long to respond to some media queries. The motto "maximum disclosure, minimum delay" is not being followed in my command. I hate having to apologize all the time for not getting answers to the media in a timely fashion. I am a lot happier when I deploy in support of a unit and am responsible for PA myself. PA is a lot more fun than (branch), by a long shot.

Survey 148 (Civilian)

I have been dealing with Public Affairs (Army) issues for the past 23 years. I spent 22 years active duty in the Army, which allowed me to travel around the world two-three times telling the Army story. I would be lying if I didn't say "this has been and continues to be the most exciting period in my life." I truly loved the Army, and my current job as Media Relations Officer for (unit) keeps me totally involved with the Army. I truly enjoy coming to work each and every day.

As a military journalist I have traveled afar. My first assignment took me to Japan where I was assigned to the Stars and Stripes staff as a sports/entertainment report. I spent nearly six years there, before being assigned to Fort Hood, TX and the 1st Cavalry Div.

Then it was on to Germany and the 1st Inf. Div. Fwd. This is where I truly honed my military journalist skills as both a reporter/photographer and Army newspaper editor. From Germany I was sent to the Military Academy at West Point. I spent four great years there covering college-level sports, deployments and the first female graduating from the Academy.

From West Point to was on to Korea and Eighth Army. I spent a five year tour in Korea covering every aspect of military/community life.

Finally, I ended up at my (present unit) with a short tour in Vincenza, Italy.

This has been perhaps the most satisfying tour of all. This unit has participated in Persian Gulf War, Hurricane Andrew Relief Operations and most recently and ongoing the Peace making/keeping efforts in Somalia.

I continually tell our young journalists that Public Affairs business is the best of the best. We are a very viable part of the Military history being recorded. Wow! It's exciting!

Survey 149 (Civilian)

In my present job, I deal only sporadically with "recipients," so many of these questions are essentially non-applicable. (I mostly write in this job.)

I should note that, in a previous job as editor of an Army- Air Force weekly paper overseas, I would have responded much more negatively on some questions. While my direct positive contribution to recipients was greater than now, I also had many more stressful contacts with them and was truly burned out, with an average 50-hour high-pressure work week.

Survey 150 (Military)

I have enjoyed working in Public Affairs however the changing from one area to your primary specialty leaves you behind your peers. If you don't get the key jobs in your branch, it does not matter how good you are in Public Affairs you will not get the advancement. Public Affairs

should be the same credit as any other job in the Army. The Air Force has a career field in Public Affairs. Why can't we?

Survey 152 (Civilian)

The U.S. Army personnel management system stinks. GS 9 PAO types are unpromotable unless they jumpship and transfer (much luck). Civilians are treated badly much of the time. Commanders do not use their assets in a smart fashion. PAO for Corps and Divisions should have some real-world experience. They shouldn't come straight out of the pentagon. Finally the army doesn't reward someone who thinks, because Command Groups are comprised of O5's and O6's who are afraid of their careers (Careerists) that OER, and are therefore ass kissers, brown nosers and psycophants. That is the primary reason good public affairs work is rarely done. Staff and non PAO types interfere with proper PAO functions to the extent of contradicting Regulation, Policy and giving Commanders bad info. Most PAO's won't support their own people or protect the functions of their own sections by speaking in conflict to a senior officers opinion.

On the military side of the house there seems to be a great deal of dissatisfaction. O3-O4's are exposed to shortages in manpower and equipment and their leadership (commanders) are not up to the game.

Survey 154 (Civilian)

Basically, I believe the job is what I make of it. My primary frustrations in not having enough time to do the projects I'd like to do and having to give short shrift to projects that are important but not critical.

Survey 162 (Civilian)

As with any position, you have good and bad days. I like my job and my "recipients," but I'm ready for a change.

Survey 172 (Civilian)

Regardless of the changes within the Army and that I'd prefer to work for another agency (or myself) I've gained a lot of good experience. Too bad the Army doesn't care whether it keeps dedicated, experienced employees or not. The downsizing of the Army has severely affected morale, health and productivity of workers. More serious incidents/accidents occur; DUIs are up; stress related illnesses are up but the Army is like the proverbial ostrich. Up until a year ago, I would have laid down my life

for my country. But the Army has destroyed that kind of loyalty. It cares little for civilians. I'll give up my retirement and leave civil service if I have to. My health and emotional well being are more important than a career with the Army.

Survey 173 (Civilian)

Have responsibilities above my pay grade. PAO leadership is weak.

Survey 182 (Civilian)

While I am very satisfied in my current job, I would probably have tried to start my career in a non-military agency if I could do it again--or see how far I would have gone in sportscasting, where I did begin my career.

Survey 186 (Civilian)

The Army does not offer public affairs as a career field for Army officers. It's just a one or two-year ticket punch, then on to a command or other duty. Most officers who become PAOs have no real interest in public affairs, and certainly no training other than the public affairs course, and it shows.

Offering it as a career field is the only way to assure that competent people remain as PAOs. I've been here for 12 years, and I'm now on my ninth PAO. This one's a civilian. Maybe that will make a difference.

Survey 189 (Civilian)

Army PA is more than dealing with "recipients" it is a well-entrenched organization with far-reaching tentacles into the military and civilian hierarchy. The same applies to Navy and Air Force. Public Affairs definitely shapes decisions based upon suspected or real public impact of what those decisions might have. You might go so far as to say Public Affairs runs the battlefield (behind the scene). From and AFRTS perspective, my "recipients" are both real customers, the audience, and the military hierarchy in Public Affairs and Command. We literally "walk the fine chalk-line" to please both. If PA is weak, we are more responsive to Commanders and of course vice versa. The "audience" always comes last after we satisfy the hierarchy. (That's a fact in the real world.)

Survey 194 (Civilian)

The survey was not designed for Public Affairs and is not a valid test instrument.

The Federal Priority Placement program can create difficult working relationships by placing individuals in a retained pay status-but in grade levels down to 3 steps below what they read.

In my case-I took a 1 step reduction to GS11 and work for a newly promoted GS11 who has limited Army experience and bullshits her way thru everything. And working conditions in a WWII barracks suck! The same as 35 years ago, they say that life is a circle-so be it!

Survey 199 (Military)

I've had 3 previous assignments in Army Public Affairs, all of which were very enjoyable and challenging. My current position could be more enjoyable if the workload reflected the reductions in staff. I remain optimistic that things are going to improve, but right now this job is very stressful due to the command climate in the unit.

Survey 200 (Civilian)

Any frustration I feel in my job is based on doing a two-person media relations branch alone. While I really do love Army Public Affairs, after 18 months as a branch chief with no assistance, I'm bushed!! But I remain determined not to take it out on my recipients.

Survey 201 (Civilian)

1. Rotate enlisted broadcasters/journalists for cross-training in command information, media relations, community relations, broadcasting and print journalism.

2. Train senior NCOs in budget/supply matters.

3. Let senior broadcasting/journalist NCOs work in PA field with hands-on experience and not be administrative gophers wasting their talents.

4. Let PA officers remain in PA throughout their Army careers like the Air Force. Don't alternate branch and PA assignments. Don't penalize officer promotions if they remain in PA for entire career.

5. Lower enlisted promotion cut-off scores for CMF 46. The Army loses too many good broadcasters/journalists who can't

get promoted because of high cut-off scores of 998 points out of 1,000.

6. Officers and enlisted need more realistic training setting in field press bureaus. If possible include civilian PA supervisors.

7. Fund PA officers to buy own camera kits instead of journalists using their own equipment most times.

8. Use electronic media. Don't rely mostly on print media.

Survey 202 (Civilian)

The support from management is not there. No money for schooling-no overtime pay- comp. only in equal amounts not 1 1/2 as in private industry. Tools not provided to accomplish mission- use POV, personal time, and personal money.

Dedication to Army and work ethic and personal satisfaction in service is motivating factor. Appreciate soldiers and their efforts-reason for service-not enough support from higher.

Survey 206 (Civilian)

Good luck with your Master's!

Maybe you can publish your survey results in the Army's PA Professional bulletin. I'd love to see your conclusions.

Survey 211 (Military)

My current job satisfaction relates more to the command working environment than to the type of work.

Dissatisfaction in PA for me is only a reflection of being under equipped to do the job. MTOE and basic mid-level leadership (O3-O7) misunderstanding of PA creates most of my frustration.

I wanted to be an Infantryman only, when I came in. I've since grown and expanded my horizons beyond basic grunt work as the need arose.

Survey 213 (Civilian)

Public Affairs can be an enriching and rewarding experience. The job demands strong interpersonal skills to effectively deal with a myriad of demands and personalities. This professional career choice has been satisfying emotionally and has opened many doors professionally. I look

forward to career progression in Public Affairs. The job necessitates "team player" capabilities. One must be flexible and mobile to reap the benefits it has to offer!

Bibliography

Bellott, Fred K. "Understanding Stress." Wilson Business Abstracts, 1982 Abstract Issue: RIEJUN83 Accession Number: ED225267

Brokke, Mervin E. (1) Personal experience related to researcher by a superior after researcher was selected to be a public affairs officer; Spring/Summer 1991.

Brokke, Mervin E. (2) During a 6/22/93 telephone conversation with Dr. Christina Maslach, professor of psychology at the University of California, Berkeley.

Brokke, Mervin E. (3) Reference is made here to the schooling offered to Army public affairs officers as mentioned in chapter 3: Background to the Problem.

Consulting Psychologists Press, General Catalog, Palo Alto: 1993.

Cook, Betsy B., Steven R. Banks. "Predictors of Job Burnout in Reporters and Copy Editors." Photocopy. 1991.

Cook, Betsy B., Steven R. Banks, Ralph J. Turner. "The Effects of Work Environment on Job Burnout in Newspaper Reporters and Copy Editors." Photocopy. 1993.

Crocker, Lawrence P. The Army Officer's Guide, 44th ed. Harrisburg: Stackpole Books, 1988.

Friesen, David. "Overall Stress and Job Satisfaction as Predictors of Burnout." Wilson Business Abstracts 1986 Abstract Issue: RIEFEB87 Accession Number: ED274698

Headquarters, Department of The Army. Public Affairs Operations, FM 46-1. Washington, D.C., 1992.

Hurrell, Jr., Joseph J., Lawrence R. Murphy, Steven L. Sauter, and Cary L. Cooper, eds. Occupational Stress: Issues and Developments in Research. New York: Taylor and Francis, 1988.

Hvezdos, Michael S. "Comparative Perceptions of the Army Public Affairs Function Among Commanding Generals and Army Public Affairs Officers." M.S. thesis, American University, 1988.

Kelly, James M. "The Role of Public Affairs in Low Intensity Conflict." Army War College, 1987.

Libutti, Frank. "The Military and the Media: A Time for Education." National War College, 1986.

Margolin, Edythe "Sociological Approaches to Issues on Teacher Burnout." Wilson Business Abstracts, 1982 Abstract Issue: RIEAUG82 Accession Number: ED214910

Maslach, Christina and Susan E. Jackson. Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual, 2nd ed. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1986.

McLean, Leslie H.; R. Wilburn Clouse, "Stress and Burnout: An Organizational Synthesis." Wilson Business Abstracts 1991 Abstract Issue: RIEJUN92 Accession Number: ED341140

Paine, Whiton Stewart, ed. Job Stress and Burnout Research, Theory, and Intervention Perspectives. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1982.

Office, Chief of Public Affairs, Department of the Army, Professional Development Guidebook: Army Public Affairs. Washington, D.C., 1992.

Office, Chief of Public Affairs, Department of the Army. Public Affairs Research Index 1986, Number 1-1. Washington, D.C. 1991

Office, Chief of Public Affairs, Department of the Army. Public Affairs Research Index 1987, Number 1-2. Washington, D.C. 1991

Office, Chief of Public Affairs, Department of the Army. Public Affairs Research Index 1988, Number 1-3. Washington, D.C. 1991

Office, Chief of Public Affairs, Department of the Army. Worldwide Public Affairs Directory, Washington, D.C., 1992.

Ross, Cecil. "Media Doctrine: The Missing Element." Air War College, 1986.

Sharpe, Gerald W. "Army/Media Conflict: Origins, Development, and Recommendations." Army War College, 1986.

Soucy, Philip E., "Role Conflict and The Army Public Affairs Officer." M.A. thesis, University of Georgia, 1978.

Wimmer, Roger D., and Joseph R. Dominick. Mass Media Research: An Introduction, 3rd ed. Bellmont: Wadsworth Publishing, 1991.